

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-49 were previously pending, with claims 11, 20-22, 28, 29, and 34-49 withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 has been amended, claims 11, 20-22, 28, and 29 have been canceled, and new claims 50 and 51 have been added. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 23-27, 30-33, 50 and 51 are currently pending in the application, with claims 34-49 withdrawn from consideration. In the office action dated September 4, 2003, the Examiner took the following action: (1) rejected claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art; (2) rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham/AAPA, as modified above, and further in view of Drahm et al.; (3) rejected claims 12-15, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham/AAPA, as modified above, in view of Cage; (4) rejected claims 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lanham/AAPA, as modified above; (5) rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lanham/AAPA, as modified above, in view of Kane; (8) rejected claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham/AAPA, as modified above, in view of Cage; (9) objected to claims 3-6, 9, 10 and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

*I. Rejection of claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.*

Claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitation of the flow tube means formed entirely from PTFE or PFA.

Since Lanham et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) does not disclose, teach or fairly suggest a flow tube formed entirely from PTFE or PFA as described in amended claim 1 above, claim 1 is not anticipated by, or unpatentable over, Lanham et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Claims 16-18, 23 and 26 all depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and as such, claims 16-18, 23 and 26 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lanham et al.

*II. Rejection of claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

Claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 all depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and as such, claims 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

*III. Addition of claims 50 and 51.*

Claims 50 and 51 have been added to characterize the process connections. Specifically, they have been added to further limit the process connection to being formed from PFA or PTFE.

Claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and as such, claims 50 and 51 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that pending claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 23-27, 30-33, 50 and 51 are in condition for allowance, and that action is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining matters that can be

handled in a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney, Curtis J. Ollila, at (303) 938-9999.

Respectfully submitted,  
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC



Date: 9/19/03

Curtis J. Ollila, Reg. No. 47,833  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No: 32827